

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that the drawing submitted on March 20, 2003 are approved. Applicant submits herewith a Replacement Drawing that corresponds to the approved corrected drawing.

Claims 1-3 and 7-10 are all the claims pending in the application. The Examiner continues to reject the pending claims, even after entry of the Preliminary Amendment dated December 4, 2003. The Examiner, however, applies a new reference, U.S. Patent No.: 6,333,582 (hereinafter referred to as USP '582), and asserts a new basis for rejecting the pending claims. That is, claims 1 and 7-10 are now rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of USP '582 in view of Iwata (U.S. Patent No.: 5,800,728), Mukai et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 5,903,083), hereinafter referred to as Mukai, and Harris et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 5,973,143), hereinafter referred to as Harris. Claims 2 and 3 are now rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over USP '582, Iwata, Mukai, and Harris and further in view of Nagayama et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 5,779,453), hereinafter referred to as Nagayama.

Double Patenting Rejections (USP '582/ Iwata / Mukai / Harris) - Claims 1 and 7-10

Claims 1 and 7-10 are rejected under the doctrine of nonobviousness-type double patenting, as set forth on pages 2-4 of the Office Action.

Applicant traverses the Examiner's rejection and submits that claims 1 and 7-10 are NOT obvious over claims 1-13 of USP '582 in view of the other applied references, either alone or in combination.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicant submits, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, that claims 1-13 of USP '582 do not teach or suggest at least "a fan mounted to each of opposite axial ends of the rotor for cooling a heat-generating member heated due to a generator output current", "said stator being disposed within a bracket having an exhaust window", and "said permanent magnets being permanent magnets of samarium-iron alloy containing titanium (Ti) and boron (B)," as recited in independent claim 1. To support this double-patenting rejection, the Examiner must rely on the claims of USP '582. *See MPEP 806.01* In the present instance, nowhere do the claims of USP '582 teach or suggest the above-quoted limitations of claim 1. Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the applied references, either alone or in combination.

Applicant submits that dependent claims 7-9 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1. Applicant submits that claim 10 is patentable at least for reasons similar to those set forth above for claim 1, as claim 10 recites the same limitations as those set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Further, Applicant maintains the arguments submitted in the previous two Amendments, and submits that there would have been NO motivation either in the references themselves or in the knowledge in the art, to combine the applied references to arrive at the present invention. For example, with respect to combining Harris with the other applied references, the Examiner maintains the previous assertion that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the rotor by embodying the permanent magnets with corrosion-resistive holding members, as doing so would allegedly provide means for securely holding the permanent magnets in place and protecting the permanent magnets from corrosion.

In response, Applicant submits that Harris discloses that pockets 36 of a fan 24 contain the permanent magnets 38, and that when the fan 24 is assembled with rotor 10, a pocket 36 containing magnet 38 is pressed under a pole finger 22 of second pole piece 14 and above body 32 of first pole piece 12. *See col. 2, lines 40-52.* On the other hand, Mukai, for example, discloses that the magnets 38 are disposed on the rotor (not in pockets of a fan) and between the various claw poles (not under and above claw poles). Therefore, at least for these reasons, Applicant submits that one skilled in the art would NOT have combined Harris with the other applied references, to satisfy the limitations of Applicant's invention, as recited in claims 1 and 7-10.

Double Patenting Rejections (USP '582/ Iwata / Mukai / Harris / Nagayama) - Claims 2 and 3

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under the doctrine of nonobviousness-type double patenting, as set forth on pages 4-5 of the Office Action.

Applicant submits that claims 2 and 3 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1. Nagayama does not make up for the deficiencies of the other applied references.


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APPLN. NO.: 09/839,209

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q63408

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Diallo T. Crenshaw
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 30, 2004